United Nations S/PV.6300 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Sixty-fifth year

Provisional

6300th meeting

Thursday, 22 April 2010, 3 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Okuda	(Japan)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Lutterotti
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Vukašinović
	Brazil	Mr. Garcia
	China	Mr. Hu Bo
	France	Ms. Tétreau
	Gabon	Mr. Mandoukou Ombegue
	Lebanon	Mr. Jaber
	Mexico	Mr. Pintado
	Nigeria	Mr. Onowu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	Turkey	Mr. Gümrükçü
	Uganda	Mr. Muhumuza
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Adams
	United States of America	Mr. DeLaurentis

Agenda

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507)

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/165)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

10-32436 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.05 p.m.

The President: I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Philippines.

Mr. Sorreta (Philippines): I join the other delegations in congratulating Japan on its presidency this month. Your outstanding and inspiring leadership, Sir, have proven valuable to the work of the Security Council.

We appreciate Japan's proactive and enthusiastic role in advancing today's issue. We commend Japan for circulating a concept paper (S/2010/165) for the Security Council's debate on the implementation of the measures set out in the note by the President of the Security Council contained in document S/2006/507. The concept paper provides us with a concise and comprehensive view of the present work of the Council and has been very useful in guiding our debate today.

The Philippines associates itself with the statement made by the representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. The enthusiastic participation of many Member States in this debate reflects the utmost importance they attach to this issue. Our delegation strongly shares that sentiment. The Philippines is among those countries that consider the improvement of the working methods of the Council to be crucial, not just to the Council's effectiveness but also to the overall success of the United Nations system. Its working methods are key to the Council's role as a guardian of international peace and security, for they greatly influence and enhance its effectiveness in performing its mandate.

Various attempts have been made to increase the Council's transparency and openness. We saw in recent months the efforts made by the Council to provide more and timely information regarding its work programme and schedule and the issues to be tackled by the incoming president of the Council. We are indeed pleased by these positive developments and urge the Council members to continue this practice.

Recently, we have also observed a higher degree of interaction and dialogue between Council members and non-members, especially on such relevant issues as peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Indeed, the greater participation of non-members to express their views on issues germane to them creates the impression that the Council also cares about the views of non-members. Not only does this reflect a growing sense of inclusiveness, but it also keeps unilateralism at bay.

However, as new developments and threats emerge, the work of the Council continues to grow and expand. These, of course, absorb the Council's resources, energy and attention. There is a need to refocus the Council's attention on the basic and core issues — peace and security — in order to achieve greater efficiency. The Council should therefore refrain, if possible, from tackling cross-cutting issues such as those more appropriately dealt with by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council or other United Nations organs. Having said this, however, the Philippines wishes to reiterate some of its previous proposals for specific amendments contained in the paper that the Philippine Mission transmitted to the General Assembly and which it gave to the permanent missions in February last year.

Mr. President, your laudable effort to convene this debate has truly rekindled the enthusiasm of non-members of the Security Council to share their views and has renewed their hope that the Council is capable of improving its working methods, which in turn will redound to the benefit of the membership of the United Nations and the international community as a whole.

The reform of the Council's working methods is itself a work in progress and much remains to be done. To this end, let me assure you that the Philippines is ready and willing to support the work of Japan and other like-minded States in achieving this lofty goal.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): Canada welcomes this opportunity to address the Security Council on this important issue. At the outset, my delegation would like to commend Japan for its long-standing commitment and very practical contributions to the discussion of how to improve the working methods of the Council.

The working methods of the Council are of interest to Council members and non-members alike.

Canada believes that there is a need for a continuing dialogue on this issue. Canada would therefore support the idea of regular annual or biannual open debates on this subject.

The Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and the authority to make decisions that are binding on all Member States. Given the heavy responsibility entrusted to the Council, there is a need to ensure that it is accountable, inclusive and transparent in its decision-making. The presidential note contained in document S/2006/507 outlines a number of important areas where the Council could improve its working methods to make them more transparent and more efficient. In the past four years, there has been some progress in implementing those measures. However, this implementation has not been consistent, and even those measures that have been implemented seem to rely disproportionately on the individual efforts of the Council President or elected members of the Council.

Canada believes that full implementation of the measures contained in presidential note S/2006/507 would go a long way towards creating a Security Council that is more transparent, efficient and accountable. It is for this reason that Canada requested a comprehensive review of the presidential note during the open debate two years ago. It is our sincere hope that the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions can undertake such a review and present its findings to the Council before the end of the year.

For the vast majority of Member States, membership of the Security Council is a rare occurrence, yet the decisions of the Security Council affect all Member States greatly. While it is clear that each Council member must act in accordance with its national responsibilities, the wider membership has a legitimate interest in knowing how these decisions are made and in contributing to them as appropriate.

One practical suggestion for improving the contribution of non-members of the Council is to resume the holding of orientation debates before discussions are scheduled on specific items on the Council's agenda. In recent years, most of the open debates of the Council have been on thematic issues. Canada would urge the Council to return to the practice of having orientation debates on country-specific agenda items, as well as on thematic issues. That would allow non-members of the Council to have input into these discussions before decisions are made.

Canada would also urge the Council to increase the transparency of its deliberations. While Canada acknowledges that private meetings of the Council are sometimes necessary, there is also a need to keep the wider membership informed about the Council's deliberations. In practical terms, this means that the Council should hold as many meetings as possible in public format. When there is a need to hold closed consultations, the members of the Council should provide systematic briefings to other interested Member States.

One area in which the Council has recently made some progress is in consultations with troop-contributing countries, and I would like to thank the delegation of Japan for its efforts in this regard as Chair of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. In the past year, there has been a noticeable improvement in the quality of the consultations with troop-contributing countries. The most effective change has been an improvement in the scheduling of consultations so that they occur before the decision on a peacekeeping mission's mandate has already been taken. This allows the Council to benefit from the significant experience of the troop-contributing countries and also ensures that there is broad support for Council decisions.

However, these improved consultations still seem to be carried out in a rather ad hoc manner. Canada would urge the Council to systematize this practice so that the input of troop contributors can be heard before the discussions on all peacekeeping mandates. A more predictable consultation mechanism would also improve the participation of troop-contributing countries and the quality of their input, thereby increasing the information available to the Council for its deliberations.

(*spoke in French*)

While presidential note S/2006/507 was an important step forward, it is also worth noting that the United Nations has changed over the past four years. As a result, there are other areas in which improvements could be made to Council working methods beyond those outlined in the presidential note. One of the most important developments of recent years is the evolution of the Peacebuilding Commission, which has a unique role to play in

assessing, prioritizing, and mobilizing support for key peacebuilding challenges that fall outside the core competencies of a peacekeeping operation.

The Commission also works to ensure that the efforts of the many actors involved in peacebuilding are better coordinated, including with respect to the mandate of United Nations missions. The holding of regular briefings is a good start, but closer and more substantive interaction between the Council and the Commission is needed. Canada would therefore recommend that the Security Council cooperate systematically with the Peacebuilding Commission earlier in the post-conflict period.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you again for having convened this meeting, Sir. Reform of the Security Council's working methods is an ongoing process to which all Member States must continue to contribute. However, it is also an area in which early action is possible in order to achieve tangible results to the benefit of Member States. Canada looks forward to continuing to engage constructively in this process in the months ahead.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of New Zealand.

Mr. McLay (New Zealand): New Zealand welcomes the opportunity to contribute today and thanks the delegation of Japan, which has a long and commendable history of promoting reform of Security Council working methods, for convening this debate.

New Zealand strongly believes that, in addition to any structural change, there needs to be wide-ranging reform of the Council's working methods. In that regard, New Zealand rejects outright the suggestion that the Council's working methods are a matter for the Council alone to decide. That is no more legitimate than arguing that citizens have no valid interest in the proceedings of their countries' courts or in the rules and procedures of the legislatures that they elect. The Council has the authority to make binding decisions. Its permanent members are here by agreement of the international community, as embodied in the United Nations Charter. And the remaining members are elected to serve the 187 Member States that do not enjoy the privilege of permanently sitting in the Council Chamber, often behind closed doors.

For those 187 — the overwhelming majority of the United Nations membership — this Council's working methods are vitally important. They affect our ability to understand and contribute to the Council's work and, in the end, like the Council's structure, directly affect the legitimacy of the Council itself. Over time, an opaque and insular Security Council will lose credibility and will not enjoy the support of the wider membership, and its role in maintaining international peace and security could diminish and perhaps, over time, even be usurped. Such a Council would at best be viewed as irrelevant; at worst, illegitimate. Furthermore, such is the overriding importance of the Security Council's role in maintaining global peace and security that its legitimacy bears directly on the very legitimacy of the United Nations itself. New Zealand believes that it is in everyone's interest to ensure that both the United Nations and its Security Council are credible, effective and strong.

The presidential note in document S/2006/507 sets out over 60 concrete steps that might improve the Council's working methods and, in turn, its legitimacy. They are steps that, as Japan's concept paper (S/2010/165) makes clear, would increase the Council's transparency, its interaction with non-members and its efficiency. In the interests of time, I will highlight just five proposals that New Zealand considers important.

First, while we accept that, in line with rule 48 of the provisional rules of procedure, private consultations are sometimes necessary, overall we believe that Council meetings should be public whenever possible. Further, essential information should be shared at those meetings, and such meetings should be outcome-focused, lest the issues be diluted by a day's worth of bland statements from Council members and non-members alike.

Secondly, thanks to the efforts of Japan, France, the United Kingdom and others, the Council's interactions with troop- and police-contributing countries have greatly improved. However, as the recent discussions on Chad demonstrated, key troop contributors are sometimes still unable to participate meaningfully in timely and sustained high-level consultations with Council members. To address this, New Zealand advocates the creative use of such Council meeting formats as informal interactive dialogues. As Council President during the Rwandan crisis in 1994, New Zealand organized regular informal meetings with troop-contributing countries. Our

experience in that case and others convinces us that such informal meetings can allow very useful communication and that they should be used more regularly. And of course, they better reflect the spirit of our Charter.

Thirdly, Member States with which the Council is dealing should also be able to participate meaningfully in high-level Council consultations. The informal interactive dialogue format used last year in discussions on Sri Lanka, and more recently on Chad, worked well. This format should become a standard Council tool for sustained interaction with non-members whose cooperation is sought by the Council. It would provide opportunities for prevention of conflict and better use of the Council's role as set out in Chapter VI of the Charter. However, while recognizing that such issues do often require private discussion, the Council also needs to remember the need to maintain a balance of transparency.

Fourthly, New Zealand would like to see draft Council documents shared with non-members sooner and with more frequency, and believes that interested parties should have greater influence in the preparation of those documents. Such sharing could be part of wider efforts to revitalize the way the Council and its secretariat make use of modern information technology. Websites, such as that used by Slovakia during its Council tenure, and now by *Security Council Report*, are good current examples, but more systematic sharing through email and other modern media would be welcome.

Finally, as France and others have pointed out, more effective discussions among Council members are desirable. New Zealand recalls that, during its most recent term on the Council, informal discussions were both interactive and strategic and allowed for substantive discussion and negotiation. Interactive engagement would improve Council effectiveness and collegiality and should be encouraged.

Those are just five of the many changes that could improve this Council's working methods. As a next step, New Zealand looks forward to Japan, as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, issuing a revised version of presidential note S/2006/507, and urges that it be accompanied by a concrete implementation plan, and we call for regular, annual or biannual debates, to assess that implementation.

If the Security Council is to maintain international peace and security, it must have the support of the Member States from which it derives its authority. Those Member States — the 187 non-permanent members — deserve better transparency, they are entitled to better interaction and, above all, they seek a more effective Security Council. Such outcomes may be in the hands of the members of this Council, but they are in the interests of all Member States.

The President: I shall now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Goledzinowski (Australia): Mr. President, I thank you for convening this important debate. I would like first to take this opportunity to commend the efforts of Japan to advance the Council's working methods, including your role as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions now and in 2006. The Working Group, of course, gave us the presidential note in document S/2006/507, which we are considering here today.

Australia supports a Council that better reflects the modern world and that is well placed to meet its demands. This, of course, involves reforming the composition of the Council. But improving the Council's working methods, including transparency, is an integral part of working towards that goal. We appreciated the point made this morning by the representative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, representing the Caribbean Community, in regard to the particular needs of the small island developing States. His is a sentiment that we share, together with our colleagues from the Pacific region.

The basic mindset of the Council should be one of active accountability and deliberate transparency. We, the Members of the United Nations, expect the Council to regard the need to justify its decisions, to share information, to consult widely and to accept input not as burdensome or optional extras, but as core elements of its working methods.

With this in mind, we recall the last debate on the Council's working methods in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968), and in particular we recall Costa Rica's suggestion that Member States should convene at least

every two years to monitor progress on reform of working methods. The idea of the Ambassador of Costa Rica, as I remember it, was that every elected member should have at least one opportunity during its term to participate in such a debate. When we heard Costa Rica's idea, we immediately endorsed it. It is therefore very pleasing to note that Japan has acted to bring this about. The next step, we would suggest respectfully, is to ensure that this debate be institutionalized on at least a biennial basis.

There are things to welcome and there are plenty of things to do more of. Monthly briefings by the Council President are appreciated; their quality has improved in recent years. We welcome recent innovations to improve the quality of consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries. Informal interactive dialogues do seem to have been useful, although Council members must keep in mind the need to provide transparency to others when it uses such closed-format vehicles. The innovations with regard to the process pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) and the creation of an ombudsman are also welcome.

As we have heard from so many speakers, including the representative of Canada most recently, greater interaction with the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is important. But as we mentioned in this room just last week, we consider it vital that peacebuilding needs be considered at the inception of a peacekeeping mission. This will demand a closer and more organic relationship between this Council and the PBC throughout the Council's consideration of a situation. The precise modalities for achieving that should be the subject of further discussion between the Council and the PBC.

We welcome the Council's engagement with the Chairs of the respective PBC country-specific configurations in its mandate renewal deliberations. This is a good first step. But how should broader peacebuilding considerations be brought to the attention of the Council when there is no PBC country-specific configuration? How does the Council, in planning a peacekeeping mission, engage with all interested peacebuilding actors — including members of the United Nations family, the international financial institutions and the relevant regional and subregional organizations — to ensure that all these actors are working in unison and that the early peacebuilding tasks undertaken by peacekeepers are part of a coherent, integrated plan? These are the sorts of questions the Council will need to address.

We join others who believe that there is much more that needs to be done. The work by the so-called group of five small countries, for example, is impressive and we agree with their recommendations, including ensuring, as the representative of Liechtenstein said earlier today, that briefings by United Nations officials are, as far as possible, accessible to all Member States. We also agree that consultations with non-members should take place as part of the standard operating procedures, and draft resolutions and presidential statements be made available to non-members of the Council once they are introduced in informal consultations. We think that the points made by the delegation of Jordan in regard to interaction with troop- and police-contributing countries were very well made.

We continue to believe that, fundamentally, the Council needs to commit to a vision of active accountability and deliberate transparency. It needs to establish metrics, qualitative and quantitative, and assess progress against them with a more effective annual report, although the earlier remarks this morning in praise of the annual report we think were entirely apposite. It should also keep in mind external assessors, such as *Security Council Report*, and harness technology, not just to bring the Council into the twenty-first century, but to look ahead as to how it should operate in five or 10 years time.

It is true that the Council's efficiency depends in part on the performance of we the non-members. We should contribute to open debates in an interactive and responsive manner rather than just read statements prepared days in advance that too often exceed time limits and disrespect our fellow members.

On this question of open debates, we were particularly struck by a suggestion made just before lunch by the Ambassador of Portugal. He suggested that, in these open debates, perhaps non-members should speak first and Council members last. We would encourage Council members to consider this. We would certainly encourage Council members to listen more attentively when non-members speak, perhaps even at the level of permanent representative. It would afford an opportunity for Council members to reflect and comment on the ideas they have heard in the course of the day at the end of the day. We think that

would be interesting, and we would appreciate the Council's thoughts on that idea.

In conclusion, there is a tradition in the Australian army that the officers eat only after the troops have been fed. Perhaps that could be food for thought.

The President: I shall now give the floor to the representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. Hernández-Milian (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, and your delegation for convening this important debate and for your leadership of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions. We hope that this open meeting will establish the practice of reviewing Security Council working methods regularly with other States Members of the Organization, as we have suggested in the past and has been stressed by the representative of Australia, a country which, among others, has supported that measure.

Costa Rica associates itself with the statement made this morning by the Permanent Representative of Liechtenstein on behalf of the group of five small countries. My delegation, as an active member of that group, is contributing with a sense of responsibility to the consideration of various elements of Security Council reform, and specifically of its working methods.

During its recent tenure as an elected member of the Council, Costa Rica contributed to the significant progress made by this organ in the implementation of the note contained in document S/2006/507. Our country welcomed the increase in the number of open meetings compared to previous years. This trend should be extended because we are still far from complying with the provisional rules of procedure establishing the public nature of Council meetings as a general rule. As we have said on other occasions, the Secretariat has the duty to facilitate the application of this rule, offering open formats for all meetings as the first option in the draft programme of work that it prepares for each presidency. It would be for members of the Council to argue for and convince the Council of the need to use the private format on an exceptional basis, when necessary.

The Council has also made greater efforts to interact in greater depth and a timelier manner with troop- and police-contributing countries. The Council should maintain the new practice of holding private meetings with those countries at least one week before it considers an item so that their points of view can be taken into account in decisions. We urge troop-contributing countries to make greater and better use of these meetings, to contribute with information and the views of their mission personnel, and to refer to specific issues relating to the implementation of mandates in the field.

The Security Council has committed to implementing the measures contained in the note contained in document S/2006/507. My country considers that the progress made in these and other fields should not depend on the will of each individual presidency, but should be affirmed in the daily practice of the Council.

Costa Rica also has first-hand experience of some other ways in which this organ still does not comply with agreed measures. The desire for all Council members to participate in the preparation and drafting of resolutions and other Council products is reaffirmed in note S/2006/507. However, in practice some very sensitive issues are somehow removed from the Council's purview and essentially defined by the permanent members, other States that are not members of the Council and the so-called groups of friends. As recommended in note S/2006/507, Costa Rica is in favour of consultations with interested States. However, these should never be to the detriment of the full participation of the elected members of the Security Council. All issues of international peace and security are of interest to and within the competence of all members.

We welcome the Secretariat's ongoing internal review of its reporting mechanisms in response to the reiterated concerns of Member States on the tardy circulation of the reports of the Secretary-General. As stated in paragraph 11 of note S/2006/507, these reports "should be circulated to Council members and made available in all official languages of the United Nations at least four working days before the Council is scheduled to consider them", including Council meetings with troop-contributing countries. Should there be significant changes in the situation in the field, these can be communicated via an addendum to the reports. The fact that reports need to be updated should not be an excuse for circulating them late.

Although my country welcomes the practice of holding monthly open debates, it is important to consider the use the Council makes of such debates. This format can be very useful not just in addressing thematic issues, as is currently the case, but also in learning about situations in various countries, whether they are new or familiar to the Council. We are also concerned about the message sent when decisions adopted by the Council in such debates are agreed upon before they take place. This would seem to indicate that the Council is not interested in hearing the points of view of the broader membership before making decisions. We invite the Council to change this practice and to initiate the negotiation of resolutions and presidential statements after having heard from the rest of the members, and not to adopt them on the same day, as has been its custom to date.

Beyond the contents of note S/2006/507, in December last year my country submitted a draft note by the President to the Informal Working Group on Documentation, with the aim of ensuring the inclusive and uniform participation of all members in Security Council missions to the field. Our intention in doing so was to clarify a number of administrative and procedural aspects of Council missions. We hope that this proposal will receive the attention of the Informal Working Group, and my country remains fully available to contribute to this process. I take this opportunity to congratulate the delegation of Japan for its leadership on this issue.

Finally, it is important to mention a mandated task on which the Security Council still falls short, although it is established in the very Charter of the United Nations. We refer to the submission of special reports to the General Assembly, a tool which could be of use in such situations as the establishment of a new peacekeeping operation or sanctions regime, or the non-action of the Council due to the use of the veto, among others.

Our delegation reaffirms its conviction that working methods are a fundamental component of the process of comprehensive Security Council reform. The implementation of the measures already agreed to improve its working methods and the adoption of new measures would lead to greater effectiveness in the work of the Council and thus to greater transparency and accountability. We believe that progress on working methods should not hinge on progress or success in other areas of reform. We are convinced that, through substantive reform of the working methods, we can help to remove the obstacles that occasionally impede the smooth running of the Security Council and its relations with other bodies.

The President: I now call on the representative of Argentina.

Mr. Argüello (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): We thank the delegation of Japan for having organized this open debate on working methods. Argentina has witnessed the constructive efforts pursued by Japan on this issue, having participated in 2006 in the drafting of the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507, a legal instrument that has become the document of reference for this topic, filling, to some extent, the gap in the Security Council's rules of procedures.

The issue of the lack of transparency in the working methods of the Security Council is directly related to questions regarding the effectiveness and representativeness of the Council. In this regard, we believe that the valuable efforts deployed by Japan, Slovakia, Panama, Belgium, Viet Nam, Uganda and Costa Rica in recent years are valid and commendable, but we also believe that they are not enough. We still do not have measures that genuinely improve the transparency, participation and effectiveness of the work of the Council.

We believe it very important to pursue reform aimed at strengthening the institutional balance and relations between the Security Council and the other principal organs of the United Nations through regular official consultations, cooperation mechanisms and adequate exchange of information. In addition to enhancing cooperation between the Council and the General Assembly, regular and substantive dialogue should be established with the Economic and Social Council, reinforcing the communication provided for by Article 65 of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as with the Human Rights Council and the Peacebuilding Commission.

With regard to the accountability of the Security Council for its actions to the membership of the United Nations as a whole, a more detailed and analytical substantive annual report should be submitted to the General Assembly. The Council should also, whenever necessary or relevant, submit special reports to the General Assembly, pursuant to Articles 15 and 24 of the Charter.

Finally, we believe that there is a tendency to convene too many open thematic debates, which run the risk of becoming marathons of speeches without specific, clear and effective results. As I already noted, we recognize the progress that has been made in several areas, such as the monthly programme of work, the monthly briefings and assessments by the President, the clear improvement of the annual report to the General Assembly, and relations with troop-contributing countries.

In closing, we note our recognition of the substantial and very useful nature of the latest report on working methods produced by the organization *Security Council Report*.

The President: I call on the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Benítez-Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba welcomes the convening of this important debate on a topic of interest to us all. We should also like to express our full support for the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The position of Cuba is clear. The Security Council needs to undergo comprehensive, urgent and far-reaching reform. There can be no genuine reform of the United Nations until the Security Council is reformed.

Security Council reform must by necessity include the modification of its working methods. In recent years, there have been modest changes in the working methods of the Council, including on some of the issues raised in the note contained in document S/2006/507 and subsequent notes by the President of the Council. But the majority of the changes have been somewhat formal and, in reality, the Council is neither transparent, democratic nor efficient.

Unfortunately, the permanent members — and on occasion not even all of them — in particular when dealing with highly important issues, continue to negotiate behind closed doors, where they take decisions of fundamental importance that are later presented as faits accompli to the other members of the Council and the rest of the membership of the United Nations.

Cuba believes that, as a minimum, the following urgent changes, to mention but a few, are necessary to the working methods of the Council.

The number of public meetings should be increased, in accordance with Article 31 and 32 of the Charter of the United Nations. Closed meetings and unofficial consultations should take place only in very exceptional circumstances. The State concerned should be allowed to participate in Council discussions on topics that affect it directly, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter. The opinions expressed by Member States in thematic open debates should be reflected in the resolutions and presidential statements of the Council. Those countries that are not members of the Council should be guaranteed access to subsidiary bodies and the right to participate in their discussions. The Council's rules of procedure, which remain provisional after more 60 years, should be formalized in order to increase transparency and accountability.

Cuba notes with serious concern the growing tendency of the Council to consider matters and assume functions that are not within its competence, usurping the role granted by the Charter to other bodies, in particular the General Assembly. This trend must be stopped as a matter of urgency. The Council needs, as soon as possible, to carry out a profound revision of its agenda and to bring it in line with its mandate. The Council should strictly observe the provisions of the Charter and all the resolutions of the General Assembly as the main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the United Nations.

The Council must give due account of its work to the General Assembly by submitting truly analytical annual reports, as well as special reports as provided for under Articles 15 and 24 of the Charter of the United Nations. Such special reports, unfortunately, still do not exist.

The question of the veto is intrinsically linked to the working methods of the Council, especially its decision-making mechanism. The veto is an anachronistic and anti-democratic privilege that should be eliminated as soon as possible. Until that happens, it would be important as a first step to consider various options for limiting the use of the veto, such as limiting the use of the veto to votes on measures adopted by the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter; allowing for the possible annulment of the veto through an affirmative vote by an agreed number of Council members in line with the number of members of an expanded Council; or allowing for a possible

annulment of the veto by a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly.

In conclusion, I stress our conviction that a more transparent Council would be a more legitimate Council. A more inclusive and accessible Council that truly takes into account the opinions of the Member States of the Organization would be a more effective Council. We already have a significant number of specific proposals to improve the Council's working methods, such as those presented by the Non-Aligned Movement. What we need now is to take action without further delay.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's debate on an issue to which we attach great importance. We thank the Japanese presidency for the concept paper (S/2010/165) and for its continued stewardship since 2009 of the Council's Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

The very fact that the Security Council is holding an open debate on the issue of its working methods is in and of itself of some significance. While we acknowledge the prerogative of the Council to set its own working methods, we have always argued that, since the Council acts on behalf of the United Nations membership, it is both natural and legitimate for the latter to discuss the Council's working methods.

India associates itself with the growing clamour for early reform of the working methods of the Council, which is an integral part of the broader imperative of the comprehensive reform and expansion of the membership of the Council in both the permanent and non-permanent categories. The overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations has already reiterated its support for such reforms.

The Council will render great service to the cause of maintaining international peace and security by deepening and enriching its consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries in the devising, revision and implementation of the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions. In addition, such constructive consultations can and will have a salutary impact on the ongoing efforts to enhance the transparency and effectiveness of the Council's work.

Another area that cries out for urgent reforms relates to the Council's annual report to the General Assembly. At present, the annual report continues to be a statistical compilation of events — a bland summary and listing of meetings and outcome documents. It is important that the General Assembly be aware not only of what decisions were taken, but also of the rationale, efficacy and impact of the Council's decisions in terms of crystallized take-aways for the membership of the General Assembly. Further, it is important for the Council to submit, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly, in accordance with Article 24 (3) of the Charter, for the consideration of the Assembly in accordance with Article 15 (1) of the Charter.

Apart from the specific areas of reform that I have already mentioned, my delegation believes that the Council should urgently undertake the following measures.

First, as a general rule, the Council must meet in meetings open to all United Nations Member States.

Secondly, it must implement Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter by consulting on a regular basis with non-members, especially those with a special interest in the substantive matter under consideration by the Council.

Thirdly, it must grant non-members access to its subsidiary organs, including the right to participate as appropriate.

Fourthly, it should make available to non-members draft resolutions and presidential statements, as well as other draft documents that are submitted at the Council's informal consultations of the whole for action on its agenda items, as soon as such documents are submitted or earlier, if so authorized by the author of the draft.

Fifthly, it must hold frequent, timely and substantive briefings for non-members on the matters discussed in the Council and its subsidiary organs, including briefings on its ad hoc missions, their terms of reference and the findings of such missions.

Sixthly, it should hold regular consultations with the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

My delegation is supportive of the ongoing efforts, including and particularly those of the group of five small countries (S-5), to bring about improvements in the Council's working methods. Such efforts have succeeded in keeping the issue of working methods high on the reform agenda.

Yet we must acknowledge that real progress has been minimal, despite years of efforts. Some permanent members continue to argue that the reform of the working methods cannot be discussed by non-members. Even many of the decisions adopted by the Council in the note contained in document S/2006/507 remain unimplemented, and there appears to be little appetite for the far-reaching reforms that the large majority is demanding. This only strengthens our view that the many flaws in the Council's working methods are merely symptoms of a deeper malaise rooted in its structure and composition.

Clearly, genuine and lasting improvement of the working methods of the Council can be possible only as part of a comprehensive process of Security Council reform, based on both the reform and expansion of its composition in the permanent and non-permanent categories. Until there is a change in the real power structure of the Council — its permanent membership — we cannot realistically expect the deep-seated changes that the large majority seeks.

We invite the S-5 and others to work closely, actively and in lock-step with the wider international community seeking comprehensive reforms of the Council. In the absence of such comprehensive reform, a fundamental improvement in the working methods will either elude us, as it has for more than 60 years, or, even if miraculously achieved, would not last without the institutional memory, continuing commitment and peer example of new permanent members.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Vidal (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Greater transparency, efficiency and interaction with non-Council members are goals shared by all. We are aware of the commitment of the delegation of Japan to the permanent improvement of the Council's working methods, and we congratulate it on that initiative.

The review of the Security Council's working methods is a subject of great importance to Uruguay. We believe that Member States have the right to participate in the negotiation and decision-making processes of the Organization's organs, especially when they have a direct interest in the results of the deliberations and when those results affect their citizens or their highest objectives. A concrete example of this is the interaction between the Council and troop- and police-contributing countries in the context of decisions on peacekeeping operations.

It is fair to acknowledge here that, since the most recent open debate on this subject (see S/PV.5968), tangible and substantive progress has been achieved with regard to this legitimate demand by police- and troop-contributing countries. On the one hand, private meetings with troop- and police-contributing countries have been convened further in advance of mandate renewals. At least in principle, that gives the Council time to consider the inputs of those countries. We hope that this practice will continue and that the implementation of resolution 1353 (2001) will be stepped up.

On the other hand, we highlight the reactivation, in 2009, of the informal consultation mechanism involving the members of the Security Council, troop and police contributors and the Secretariat in the context of the Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. We believe that the exchanges at various meetings on significant challenges to specific missions have been very useful and productive. We hope that the Working Group will relaunch such meetings with troop and police contributors as soon as possible. We also hope that it will be possible to debate cross-cutting issues that have been identified as relevant to the entire peacekeeping system. We also hope that such meetings will be made part of the institutional framework, rather than being left up to the presence or absence of a given country in the Security Council.

On another front, we express our general concern about the link that has been established between the issue we are debating today and the reform of the composition of the Council, as if they were inextricably linked. As we have said on other occasions, these are two inexplicably linked issues that cannot serve as a mutual basis for negotiation. Some time ago, the group of five small countries (S-5) submitted to the General Assembly draft resolution A/60/L.49, which contained worthwhile suggestions and proposals that could be adopted today itself by the

vast majority of Members. The way in which that valuable proposal was received was not especially productive. The fact is that the working methods of the Security Council have been held hostage to the Council's enlargement, which is an extremely difficult issue.

Uruguay supports draft resolution A/60/L.49 submitted by the S-5, as well as similar documents put forward in connection with it. In the context of that proposal, we are prepared to consider a package that moves us towards the single undertaking referred to by some States. However, we reiterate that we believe that the Council's working methods and expansion are two separate issues that can be resolved on different tracks.

Let us rekindle the spirit of draft resolution A/60/L.49 and of the worthwhile efforts of the S-5. Let us now propose a set of measures that will make it possible to improve the Council's working methods. Let us make it possible to realize those valuable proposals on which almost all of us agree.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Malta.

Mr. Borg (Malta): My delegation would like to join other delegations in expressing appreciation to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Security Council for giving us this opportunity to participate in this interesting open debate on the implementation of the measures set out in the note contained in document S/2006/507, concerning the working methods of the Security Council. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you, Sir, for your concept paper (S/2010/165), which is making a valuable contribution to this debate.

Improving the transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of the working methods of the Security Council must continue to serve as a pillar of Council reform, which also continues to be the subject of debate in the context of the five inextricably linked key issues within the framework of the intergovernmental negotiations. Increased transparency in the working methods of the Security Council would increase not only the credibility and legitimacy of the Council, but also its accountability, in particular at a time when the effectiveness of the Council is continually being tested. In that regard, Malta welcomes the measures taken recently by the Security Council to improve those three dimensions of a progressive and open Security Council.

While much more has to be done to reach an optimal level of transparency, Malta believes that the monthly briefings by incoming Council Presidents on the programme of work and the increase in detail contained in the annual report of the Security Council that is presented to the General Assembly have enhanced the relationship between the members of the Council and the wider membership of the United Nations. We also welcome the missions to the field undertaken by Security Council members, thereby bringing the work of the Council closer to Governments and peoples.

It is an acknowledged fact that the adoption of improved working methods depends in principle on the members of the Security Council themselves. However, we believe that the views of the general membership of the United Nations should continue to receive positive consideration by the Security Council membership, including through the holding of open debates and briefings and fewer closed meetings. That would in turn enhance access to and participation in the work of the Council for all members, especially small States.

There is a false perception that many issues before the Security Council are the exclusive responsibility of its members, and in particular of permanent members. However, that perception is fading with time owing to the growing recognition that current threats are becoming increasingly global and transnational in nature. No boundaries exist for such threats. The matters that are brought to the attention of the Council are therefore issues that call for the greater involvement of and engagement by and with non-members or the Council.

My delegation acknowledges that some progress has been made with regard to regular consultations between the Council and the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Chairs of the Commission's country-specific configurations. In welcoming such an improvement, we feel that the Security Council needs to make more space for the Peacebuilding Commission in order to allow it to further secure its place within United Nations structures.

As a small State, Malta believes that an improved and enhanced working relationship between the Security Council and the other principal organs, in particular the General Assembly, through regular and institutionalized consultations should be a matter for

further consideration by the Council. The ongoing dialogue between the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council is commendable and should be further encouraged.

The number of challenges facing the Council is on the increase, thereby placing additional burdens on the workload and efficiency of the Council. In that context, consideration must be given to making existing United Nations technical information and information-gathering capabilities more effective through the use of information technology. Such information — including prompt, relevant and current information on matters with which the Council is seized — should be made accessible not only to the members of the Security Council, but also to the membership of the United Nations a whole. That would enable all Member States to better assess conflicts and disputes that require an urgent, if not immediate, response by all countries concerned. That would be especially helpful in assisting the members of the Council to take timely and appropriate action to prevent the aggravation of particular situations or disputes.

The working methods by which the Council operates are crucial to the way the Council is held accountable for the maintenance of international peace and security. While noting the valid contribution being made by the group of five small countries, Malta encourages Council members to continue to explore ways on how to improve the working methods of the Security Council by ensuring enhanced transparency, effectiveness and interaction with non-members of the Council.

It is important that all Member States not only feel that they own the United Nations reform process, including that of the Security Council, but also that they continue to assume the guardianship of our Organization, of which the Security Council is a principal organ.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Khazaee (Islamic Republic of Iran): Let me express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, for convening this important meeting and for distributing the concept paper (S/2010/165) to facilitate the implementation of the note contained in document S/2006/507 on the working methods of the Security Council. While associating my delegation with the statement of the Non-Aligned Movement, delivered by the representative of Egypt, let me also share and emphasize the following points.

As is correctly stated in the concept paper annexed to the letter contained in document S/2010/165, the lack of improvement in the three interlinked and key issue areas of transparency, interaction with non-members and efficiency in the working methods of the Security Council is at the core of today's discussion. I wish to build on those shortcomings by further elaborating, as follows.

First, according to Article 24 of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council should act on behalf of all United Nations Member States. However, in reality, the Council's decisions not only decreasingly reflect the wish and the views of the general membership, but also, in many cases, do not even represent the genuine opinion of its own general membership.

Secondly, despite the requirement of the Council's own decisions on its working methods, including those contained in document S/2006/507, which, for instance, call for consultation by the Council with:

> "the broader United Nations membership, in particular interested Member States, including countries directly involved or specifically affected, ... when drafting, inter alia, resolutions, presidential statements and press statements," *(S/2006/507, section VII, para. 42)*

in many cases the general membership and even the countries concerned are kept totally uninformed of the negotiations on resolutions or statements directly affecting them, let alone their views on the Council's outcome documents being sought. That is also the case for non-permanent members when they are frequently faced with the situation of secretive negotiations being held among a few permanent members on important issues.

Thirdly, the refusal to allow non-members of the Council to participate in discussions on matters affecting them and their interests, and the denial to the countries concerned of the right to brief the Council on their positions on issues having a direct effect on their national interests, and, more crucially, of their right of reply to countries against which allegations are raised

during certain formats of the Council's meetings are in total disregard of Article 31 of the Charter.

A fourth shortcoming is the ongoing trend of selective notification of Council meetings and the failure to convene regular and necessary briefings.

Fifthly, the quick and unnecessary resort to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and the threat or use of sanctions in cases where no action has been necessary are other disturbing facts that have undermined the credibility and legitimacy of the Council's decisions.

Sixthly, as has been mentioned by various delegations on different occasions, the veto power has always raised concerns and criticism on various grounds among a significant majority of Member States. There is a strong sense of injustice and discrimination between the haves and the have-nots. In fact, the veto is a non-constructive instrument that undermines the possibility of action by the Council in many cases where it is needed.

To increase the transparency of its work, to strike a balanced approach in interaction with non-members, and to improve the efficiency of its working methods, the Council should seriously address the said shortcomings and take into consideration the relevant provisions of the Charter and of the resolutions that clarify its relationship with the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations.

Finally and undoubtedly, impartiality, transparency and fairness are key premises on which the Security Council should base its approach to discharging its responsibilities mandated by the Charter. Every effort should be made to render the Council more democratic, representative and accountable. My delegation stands ready to contribute to the achievement of those goals.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Singapore.

Mr. Menon (Singapore): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate on the implementation of the note contained in document S/2006/507 on the Security Council's working methods. Member States last had the opportunity to express their views on this important topic in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968).

Singapore fully subscribes to the statement delivered by the representative of Liechtenstein on behalf of the group of five small countries, of which we are a member.

Among the areas of Security Council reform, we believe that the issue of working methods is one that commands widespread support and resonance with Member States. It is also an area that is objectively logical to develop, but has been practically mired in the reluctance of the Council to open itself up to scrutiny by fellow Member States.

The provisional rules of procedure of the Council state that meetings shall be held in public. Unfortunately, that premise of transparency has been eroded over the years in favour of so-called effectiveness and functionality. It is supposed to be easier to broker deals to save the world in back rooms than in boardrooms. Yet, it strains the bounds of credulity for Member States to hear each year, in the face of constant threats to regional peace and human dignity, that the Council has discharged its responsibility for maintaining peace and security. It is absolutely true that the Council has to manage serious global complexities with less than adequate resources, but it is also true that the Council is sometimes prey to its own practices, which add to the complexities rather than solve them.

Thus, it was significant that the Council adopted note S/2006/507, signalling recognition of the need to improve how it functioned. That document contains many measures to address the three areas identified by the President for possible discussion during this open debate, namely, transparency, interaction and dialogue with non-members, and efficiency. In practice, however, the implementation of the document's contents has been uneven.

Transparency is one area of great interest to Singapore, as it promotes a sense of accountability in the Organization. However, we should not mislead ourselves into believing that reports and briefings alone can ensure greater transparency. The notion of openness extends to developments as simple as an explanation for the sudden shift in the date of this open debate or the provision of adequate notification of important meetings of the Council.

It should also extend to the access that non-members, the Secretariat and even members of the press have to Security Council members and, where

relevant, their deliberations. In that connection, there has been some concern over the perceived curtailing of such access, ostensibly due to the limitations imposed by the relocation of the Security Council Chamber as part of the Capital Master Plan. That is an issue of transparency and needs to be addressed.

We acknowledge that there has been some improvement in the opportunities for interaction and dialogue between the Council and non-Council members. That includes interactions with troop- and police-contributing countries, as well as regional organizations, consultations between the Security Council and Member States in the preparation of the annual report, and briefings by Security Council presidents on each month's programme of work.

However, much more could be done, particularly on issues of interest and concern to Member States. For example, countries directly affected by a particular issue being considered by the Security Council should be given every opportunity to participate in the deliberations. Beyond interaction and dialogue, the Council should also not fear opening up its proceedings to non-members. Ultimately, it is in the interest of the Council to create a climate of trust, which is possible only if Member States are better able to appreciate and understand the decision-making considerations, processes of and challenges faced by the Council.

The Council's scorecard on efficiency is middling. The Security Council, in document S/2006/507, undertook to maintain regular communication with the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council for better coordination among the principal organs of the United Nations. However, its implementation has been cursory when it could easily be a catalyst to streamline processes within the Organization and demonstrate the Council's commitment to promoting greater efficiency within the United Nations system. As a simple example, when the Security Council decides to establish a special political mission, it makes sense to ensure that the Fifth Committee is notified without delay and provided with as comprehensive a picture as possible, enabling it to factor such information into its consideration of the overall resource requirements necessary for such missions.

Without this basic coordination, unnecessary complications can arise and precious resources wasted. In December 2009, the Council took decisions on three special political missions. At the same time, the Fifth Committee had been considering the budget for such missions for the coming biennium 2010-2011. Even though the Council's decisions had been taken before the Fifth Committee concluded its work for the main session, information on the three special political missions that would have affected the outcome of the Committee's deliberations was not forthcoming.

While the appropriate course of action is for the Fifth Committee to be notified through a report of the Secretary-General, accompanied by recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, this process takes time. As a result, the resource requirements for these three missions had to be taken up separately when the Fifth Committee resumed its work in March 2010. This led to difficult negotiations, as some countries were resistant to the idea of increasing the overall budget for special political missions to accommodate these additional resource requirements, while others were concerned that absorbing this cost under the overall budget for such missions would negatively impact existing missions. While a solution was eventually found, many of the complications could have been avoided if a system had been in place to better facilitate the flow of information between the Security Council and the Fifth Committee from the inception of these special political missions. It is incumbent upon Member States to see what we can do to improve such working methods and thereby enhance the efficiencies of both the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Singapore appreciates the opportunity of this open debate. We are encouraged by the Security Council's willingness to continue its engagement on this issue and its efforts to better implement the contents of document S/2006/507. We look forward to continuing our discussions with the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions later this year, and to further open debates.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ukraine.

Mr. Sergeyev (Ukraine): I would like to thank you, Sir, for holding this important meeting and congratulate you on a successful presidency. We broadly share the priorities for today's debate arising from the concept paper (S/2010/165), namely,

transparency, interaction with members at large and the efficiency of the Council. Japan's valuable contribution to reinforcing these three pillars is well known and much appreciated.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the Council, coupled with its openness and transparency, were the guidelines of Ukraine's first and so far only Council tenure as an independent State in 2000 and 2001. One of the main lessons we learned was that greater transparency and interaction with the general membership are essential to the support of the Council's decisions and their implementation in the most critical areas, such as peacekeeping, counter-terrorism, sanctions and others.

We welcome the number of new positive developments thereafter, including the 2006 presidential note under discussion today (S/2006/507). One of these relates to the strengthening of the thematic edge of the Council's agenda. It bodes well for the United Nations relevance that such pressing issues as maritime piracy, the protection of civilians, post-conflict peacebuilding, drug and arms trafficking and other challenges have been featured more and more prominently among the Council's activities.

Against this backdrop and with due consideration for the primary responsibility of the Council in the maintenance of interventional peace and security, we would like such major topics as conflict prevention to be more visible on the Council's radar. The sheer complexity of this issue should not discourage the Council from digging deeper into the richness of preventive diplomacy. There are far too many crises in which no timely alarm goes off before their eruption.

The way the Council interacts with the troop- and police-contributing countries is of great importance to Ukraine. We take positive note of some welcome changes in this area thanks to collective and individual efforts within the Council. The collective input, channelled through the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations established in 2001 with the active support of Ukraine, proved to be particularly instrumental. Private consultations with troop-contributing countries well in advance of Council meetings on relevant missions, such as those held this month, are among the features that have to become customary.

Yet there is room for further progress in the Council's techniques in the area of peacekeeping, especially in giving troop-contributing countries a stronger voice in the decision-making process. In our view, more regular consultations between the Working Group and the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations would serve that purpose. The choice of the Working Group to close capability gaps as one of its priorities for this year is quite fitting for such cooperation.

Ukraine welcomes improvements in the Council's handling of sanctions regimes by ensuring their targeted and, where possible, time-bound character, spelling out concrete conditions for lifting, improving listing and de-listing, and providing for periodic assessment. We encourage the Council's members to further refine its methodology in this sphere.

We know, including from our own experience in the Council, that much of what has been achieved by this body can be attributed to the contribution of its rotating members. They enter the Council with innovative ideas, creative energy and an appetite for making a mark on its work. That is why we believe that the Council should look further into the most effective ways of channelling and maximizing the profit from this contribution. The need for more insight into the Council's affairs is widely recognized by non-members. In this regard, one could make a practical suggestion for formalizing the currently ad hoc yet valuable practice of holding regular briefings for the regional groups by the non-permanent members they delegated to the Council. In the same vein, we see merit in giving due consideration to the idea of revisiting the practice of interactive end-of-presidency wrap-up meetings. In our view, members and non-members of the Council alike would equally benefit from this.

Ukraine encourages the Council to maintain and build on the positive dynamic in streamlining its modus operandi, while becoming more open and transparent. In this regard, we believe that some recent changes in terms of access to the Council are of a technical and temporary nature.

We look forward to the revised version of the 2006 presidential note and to continuing today's discussion in a more systematic manner. Ukraine remains fully committed to a strong, effective, efficient and transparent Security Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Ney (Germany): Let me express my gratitude to you, Sir, for having prepared and convened this very useful debate. Your concept paper (S/2010/165) provides a helpful summary of what has been achieved since the Council's last debate on the issue (see S/PV.5968) and where there is still room for improvement. I would also like to thank the group of five small countries — Costa Rica, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Singapore and Switzerland — for their valuable ideas on and unwavering commitment to this significant issue.

The three issues highlighted in the concept paper — transparency, interaction and efficiency — rightfully continue to occupy centre stage in this debate. Let me address transparency first.

With the increased involvement of the United Nations in conflict resolution around the world in recent years, the role of the Security Council has become ever more prominent. This heightened level of activity has been accompanied by a growing interest of the general membership in the Council's proceedings. Thus, now more than ever, transparency is of paramount importance if the Council is to meet expectations. While we welcome progress in this regard, transparency could be enhanced by further moving the consultative process into the open. There is little rationale for having routine meetings take place behind closed doors. Also, Council documents such as reports, statements and draft resolutions, as well as briefing notes, should be made available to non-members in a timely fashion.

With regard to enhanced interaction with the general membership, we strongly support the notion that access to the Council by affected parties should be facilitated. This should include, first and foremost, Member States that have a vested interest in the item under discussion, such as countries contributing troops or police to a peacekeeping operation. This should also include increased cooperation with the main financial contributors. It is certainly fruitful to also consider enhanced interaction with stakeholders outside the United Nations membership, such as non-governmental organizations or non-State actors, that play a crucial role in solving a specific conflict. These forms of interaction could provide the Council with an even better basis for its decisions and ultimately make it more effective. In this regard, we welcome the use of new formats such as informal interactive dialogue.

Let me add that interaction should also be strengthened with other institutions within the United Nations, for example the Peacebuilding Commission. The Security Council needs to consider ways to maximize the use of the Peacebuilding Commission's advisory role, particularly with regard to early peacebuilding activities carried out by peacekeepers. To that end, we need a stronger, organic and more dynamic linkage between the Council and the Commission throughout the various stages of the Council's consideration of a specific conflict.

The fact that the Security Council is today holding its third open debate on this subject under Japan's tenure is in itself an expression of the welcome attention this body is paying to improving the interaction with non-members of the Council. The long list of speakers for this meeting in turn demonstrates the great interest of the general membership in further pursuing this path.

Of course, increased access for non-members must not undermine efforts to make the work of the Council more efficient. We are convinced, however, that transparency, interaction and efficiency can be enhanced hand in hand. Let me assure members that Germany, as a candidate for a non-permanent seat on the Council for 2011-2012, remains deeply committed to the aim of improving the Council's working methods and that this commitment will continue should we take a seat at this table.

While efforts to further improve the working methods of the Council remain necessary, we must not lose sight of the one big step this Organization has yet to take: a comprehensive reform of the Security Council that will make this body more legitimate, more representative and thus more effective. The question of its working methods cannot and must not be de-linked from the overall reform debate, as improving working methods alone will not bring about the change desired by the general membership.

We must address the fundamental issue: the necessity of bringing the Council into line with the geopolitical realities of today's world. We must address the untenable underrepresentation of Africa, Latin America and Asia, as well as the need to ensure adequate representation of other major contributors to the maintenance of peace and security. To improve working methods without reforming Security Council structures would ultimately create a source of political

frustration among the general membership and risk eroding the authority of the Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Colombia.

Ms. Blum (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation welcomes the convening of this debate on a matter of special importance to our Organization, in particular in the context of the ongoing process of Security Council reform. The note by the President of the Security Council contained in document S/2006/507 contains guidelines that deserve careful consideration with a view to enhancing the Council's transparency and effectiveness. Colombia welcomes the efforts made by the members of this organ to implement the practices outlined in that document.

We highlight the interaction by countries holding the Council presidency with Member States and the briefings given at the beginning of each month. Equally useful are the exchanges held by the Permanent Representative of the country in the presidency with media representatives and the webcasts of those exchanges.

Nevertheless, these practices must continue to be expanded in order further improve transparency and the participation of the membership in the Council's activities and decision-making. Efforts should be made to reduce the number of closed meetings that limit access by Member States and to guarantee the participation of States non-members of the Council in the discussion of matters that affect them directly. Moreover, it would be important to create greater opportunities for consultation with regional groups and organizations as well as with other actors, as necessary, to gain a greater understanding of the specific characteristics of each situation.

Advance circulation of or access to draft resolutions would be another step towards greater transparency in the work and decision-making of the Council. Member States should be fully informed about decisions the Council intends to make before they are finalized. A predictable and transparent decision-making process is necessary to strengthen the legitimacy of the Council's actions. To that end, efforts must be made to establish formal rules of procedure.

We recognize the efforts of the permanent members to limit the use of the veto, but we consider that regulating its use under clear parameters would be an important step towards greater transparency in the work of this organ. One could seek to limit the use of the veto to situations under Chapter VII of the Charter and only in situations calling for the use of force or the imposition of sanctions. That would be in accordance with the Council's mandate to guarantee the maintenance of international peace and security.

In a similar vein, the use of the veto could be limited to substantive, not procedural, matters, and consideration could be given to increasing the number of negative votes required by permanent Council members. For example, the veto might come into play only with the negative votes of at least two of those members.

In a broader sense, the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly is another element of particular relevance to this debate. There is a significant imbalance in that relationship. This is explained to a great extent by the Council's appropriation of General Assembly matters. According to the United Nations Charter, the General Assembly is the principal deliberative, policymaking and participatory body. Its mandate is comprehensive and includes matters related to disarmament and the maintenance of peace and security, as well the consideration of matters related to human rights and humanitarian law.

While the Council's working methods and its relations with the General Assembly have improved, there is still room for improvement, including periodic meetings among the Presidents of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council and the submission of regular analytical reports by the Council to the Assembly.

To conclude, allow me to emphasize that for my delegation modifying the working methods of the Security Council is an important part of the comprehensive Security Council reform process. We will therefore support all efforts and initiatives aimed at making the Council an organ that is more democratic and representative and more transparent and effective.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Kenya.

Mr. Muita (Kenya): Mr. President, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to contribute to this important debate. I wish at the outset to associate myself with the statements made by the representative

of Sierra Leone, who spoke on behalf of the African Group, and by the Permanent Representative of Egypt, who spoke on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Since the World Summit of 2005, momentum has been building on the question of Security Council reform. Member States have shown keen interest in the process of reform, as is evidenced by their robust engagement throughout the past year.

My delegation considers the subject of the Security Council's working methods to be an extremely important part of the wider debate on Security Council reform. Indeed, we understand the reform of the working methods to be an integral part of the comprehensive discussions that we have been holding during the course of the past year. We look forward to actively participating in the forthcoming round of intergovernmental negotiations.

In July 2006, the Security Council adopted the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507, which seeks to improve the working methods of the Council. We acknowledge that the adoption of the note was a significant step forward aimed at advancing the call for meaningful reform of the Council's working methods. That having been said, we, like many others, are of the view that further measures, coupled with the continued and systematic implementation of note S/2006/507, are necessary to achieve credible reforms. In that regard, my delegation urges the Council to revisit the note, take stock of the measures that the Council has taken decisions on and subsequently address the shortcomings in their implementation.

In a continuing bid to improve the Council's working methods, my delegation supports the idea of the Council going a step further in such reform. In that respect, it is important that the implementation of the measures contained in note S/2006/507 be consistent and predictable, rather than ad hoc.

The Council should also strive to improve perceptions of accountability by improving its reporting mechanism to the General Assembly. The discussion of the annual Security Council report to the Assembly should be conducted in an environment of frankness and openness, which in turn allows for a genuine exchange of views between the general membership and the Council. The Council should also improve its working methods by submitting special reports to the General Assembly apart from its annual report, as stipulated under paragraph 3 of Article 24 of the United Nations Charter.

As a troop-contributing country (TCC), Kenya appreciates the recent efforts that the Council has undertaken to improve interaction with TCCs. Strengthening cooperation between the Council, the Secretariat and TCCs enhances the possibility for success in peacekeeping operations. The importance of the mutual undertaking between those who mandate peacekeeping operations, those who plan and manage them and those who implement the mandates cannot be overemphasized. My delegation therefore welcomed the presidential statement of August 2009 (S/PRST/2009/24) that advocated for the forging of stronger and more transparent cooperation between the United Nations and TCCs through transparent consultations at all stages of peacekeeping operations.

As for the improvement of working methods, Kenya also suggests the following measures. The Security Council should finalize its provisional rules of procedure, including new methods of work and practices that have already been agreed upon. The Council should hold open public meetings at all stages of the consideration of a subject. The Council should endeavour to keep written records of formal meetings of the Council for future reference. Non-members of the Security Council should be accorded more and more regular access to the work of the Council. The Council should enhance measures to guarantee transparency in decision-making, especially in developing fairer procedures for sanctions regimes. Regular and frequent consultations and exchanges of views with other major organs of the United Nations, especially the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, should be scheduled. Briefings by the President of the Council to the General Assembly should be regular, substantive and conducted promptly after each informal consultation of the whole. Lastly, members of the Security Council should be encouraged to take a transparent approach in dealing with non-members of the Council with respect to the Council's work, with a view to deriving benefit from different perspectives on a given subject.

Kenya reiterates that the democratization of the United Nations can only occur if there is a holistic and realistic reform of the Council that will make it more transparent, accountable and legitimate. One way of achieving that is by improving the working methods of the Council and its relationship with the General

Assembly through genuine cooperation and coordination between the two organs.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me assure you of my delegation's continued engagement in the process of reforming the Security Council with a view to achieving the objectives set forth in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (A/60/RES/1). I would also like to thank the delegation of Japan for organizing this debate.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Namibia.

Mr. Mbuende (Namibia): Mr. President, at the outset, I thank you for convening this debate on the working methods of the Security Council as set out in the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507.

Namibia fully aligns itself with the statement delivered by the Deputy Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the African Group. We also fully support the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

At the 2005 World Summit, world leaders agreed that the Security Council needed to adapt its working methods so as to increase the involvement of States that are not members of the Council in its work, enhance its accountability to the membership and increase the transparency of its work.

It therefore cannot be business as usual. The Security Council has to change the way in which it conducts its business and interacts with the General Assembly and the wider United Nations membership. We note that some aspects of the Council's working methods have evolved, but that evolution has tended to be ad hoc and often is not reflected in any formal decision of the Security Council. Some of the changes in the working methods have been captured in the notes of successive Presidents of the Security Council. However, often, the language is drafted in aspirational terms rather than as firm commitments.

To the best of our knowledge, there has never been any change in the provisional status of the rules of procedures of the Security Council. It is regrettable that the rules of procedure have continued almost unchanged since their adoption, in 1946. In the view of my delegation, it is time for the rules of procedure of the Council to be formalized. We believe it to be in the interest of the Organization that this step be taken. We therefore urge Member States, especially the permanent members of the Security Council, to replace the provisional rules of procedure of the Council with standing rules of procedure. In our view, that would greatly enhance the transparency of the work of the Council.

Article 31 of the United Nations Charter provides that any Member of the United Nations that is not a member of the Security Council may participate in the discussion of any question brought before the Council whenever the interests of that Member State are specially affected. Quite often, the Security Council discusses issues without giving Member States with an interest in those issues an opportunity to participate in any meaningful way. Namibia shares the concern expressed by many delegations that this practice is contrary to the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Similarly, we have noted that, at times, elected members of the Council experience difficulties in participating effectively, particularly when draft resolutions have been negotiated behind the scenes among the five permanent members. While recognizing the need for the Council to adopt its decisions expeditiously, sufficient time should be allotted for all members of the Council to be consulted as well as for their consideration of drafts prior to any action by the Security Council on specific items.

The majority of military personnel participating in United Nations peacekeeping missions come from countries not represented on the Council. At the same time, the nature of peacekeeping operations has become substantially more risky and complex than that of the traditional peacekeeping operations of the past. Namibia would like to see further improvement in the interaction between the Council and troop-contributing countries.

Finally, the report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, which, under paragraph 3 of Article 24 of the Charter, must be submitted annually, is the most visible source of information about the work of the Council. It is therefore important that the report be analytical, providing not only an account of the matters considered by the Council in the year under review, but also an assessment of the Council's ability to deal with the problems at hand and signalling difficulties and areas where improvements could be

made. In addition, the report should continue to include an account of the work of the Military Staff Committee and of the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Czech Republic.

Mr. Kaiser (Czech Republic): First of all, I would like to thank the delegation of Japan for organizing this open debate on the implementation of the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507. We believe — and today's debate confirms our conviction — that the topic of the improvement of the working methods of the Security Council is a very important one. We acknowledge and appreciate the long-standing commitment of Japan in this regard, especially its stewardship of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

The Czech Republic fully recognizes the primary responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, as stipulated in the Charter. This role requires the Council to be action-oriented and efficient in its proceedings. However, this goal cannot and should not be achieved at the expense of transparency. The key United Nations organ should be accountable to the broader membership and the whole United Nations system; that is the only way to maintain and enhance its legitimacy when acting on behalf of us all.

The Czech Republic recognizes that the Council has already undertaken a number of important initiatives, including those referred to in the presidential note. At the same time, we are of the opinion that further steps are required in order to build trust among the Member States and create a sense of ownership of the Council's decisions, which they are all are obliged to implement.

We have studied with great interest the concept paper prepared by the Japanese presidency (S/2010/165), and we agree with its outline of the main topics: transparency, interaction of the Council with non-members and, last but not least, efficiency.

I will turn now to the issues of transparency and access. In our view, more transparency can be achieved by advancing prompt information-sharing and better access. All Member States should receive as much information as possible about the current deliberations of the Council and its subsidiary bodies. We welcome the practice of briefings by new Council Presidents, as well as greater coverage of the subsidiary bodies and all the improvements in reporting to non-members in general. Nevertheless, such reporting should be more substantial and analytical. This applies primarily but not exclusively to the annual report to the General Assembly. In this context, let me express appreciation for the recent increase in open debates of the Security Council. We welcome this progress and believe that it should be further developed.

The Czech Republic would also like to welcome the adoption of resolution 1904 (2009), improving the transparency of the listing and de-listing procedures in the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). We hope that the newly adopted measure — the establishment of the ombudsperson — will be fully explored in order to ensure the due process rights of concerned individuals and entities, including petitioners filing de-listing requests.

I would like now to say a few words on the other two issues mentioned in the concept paper, namely, interaction and effectiveness. There is no doubt that interaction with the parties that have direct interest in an issue on the table of the Security Council is of crucial importance. We appreciate the efforts made so far in this regard, but there is still room for improvement. This applies also to the relations between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries. Despite recent important initiatives, much remains to be done in engaging the troop-contributing countries in the whole decision-making process concerning peacekeeping operations, from the initial phases of shaping their mandates to their deployment and management.

Regarding a more general problem of dialogue between the Council and affected or otherwise interested non-member States, we believe that we can more benefit from such measures as ad hoc consultations or Arria Formula meetings.

In the presidential note, the Security Council expresses its intention to maintain regular communication with other principal organs of the United Nations. It is our conviction that enhancement of the working relations between the Security Council, on the one hand, and the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), on the other, is a precondition for making the whole United Nations system more

efficient. We therefore share the opinion expressed by a number of speakers today that we should further strengthen the relations between the Council and the PBC. We believe that the PBC and its country-specific configurations can contribute substantially to the work of the Council, specifically on issues relating to peacekeeping and early peacebuilding.

We believe that it is hardly possible to overestimate the importance of the interaction of the Council with regional organizations.

We are convinced that the measures aimed at increasing transparency and improving interaction should not be detrimental to the effectiveness of the Council. On the contrary, they could form the basis for a better response and a more effective decision-making process based on better knowledge of the actual challenges that the Member States are facing. At the same time, we would like to stress that all efforts aimed at improving the working methods of the Security Council are extremely important, but that they are just part of a more complex task, which is the adaptation of the Council to the realities of today's world. In other words, the improvement of the working methods will bring about meaningful difference only if the Council itself is reformed to be more representative and legitimate.

Finally, let me assure you, Mr. President, of the readiness of the Czech Republic to work with the Council and all the Member States in further improving the working methods of this key body of the United Nations system.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Mr. Escalona Ojeda (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela): On behalf of the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, I would like to thank the Permanent Representative of Japan who is presiding over the Security Council in the month of April. We also welcome the initiative of convening this open debate to consider the implementation of the measures described in the presidential note on the working methods of this Council (S/2006/507).

Our delegation associates itself with the statement made on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement by the representative of Egypt.

The review of the Council's working methods is a subject of special interest to our Government. This issue, linked to the wider sphere of the reform of this organ, is key to the full exercise of the sovereign equality of nations and to the legitimacy of the United Nations as a promoter and guarantor of international peace and justice.

The most recent rounds of intergovernmental negotiations on this subject showed that most Member States agree on the need to make the Security Council more transparent and accountable. There have also been repeated calls to reverse the Council's tendency to take control of issues that have been the exclusive responsibility of the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly; to take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly on questions relating to international peace and security; and to improve the Council's accountability to the General Assembly by submitting substantive and analytical reports to it.

Venezuela has joined in these calls and hereby reaffirms its support for those proposals. In that regard, the definitive approval of Security Council rules of procedure is a crucial step to establish the explicit procedures necessary for the Council to comply with its obligations to the General Assembly under the provisions of the Charter.

We here to stress the need to guarantee that non-members of the Council enjoy early and timely access to all resolutions and statements of this organ, as well as the importance of promoting the access and participation of non-permanent members in all its deliberations and consultations. We are certain that the consideration of different perspectives will make the Council's work more efficient because it will ensure a more all-encompassing and balanced treatment of issues within its authority, effectively and fairly reflecting the interests and needs of countries of the North and the South. However, this aspiration can become reality only if the closed meetings and briefings of the Security Council are limited and the number of open sessions is increased.

To conclude, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to recall that, as the representative of Egypt stated, any effort to improve the working methods of the Security Council will require significant political resolve within the Council itself and the implementation of the diverse and constructive proposals made by Member States to

make the workings of this organ more transparent and more legitimate.

The President: I shall now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Zainal Abidin (Malaysia): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting and for your concept paper (S/2010/165). My delegation aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The concept paper that we have before us all too quickly assumes that the aim of prompt and effective action is inherently incompatible with that of gaining the support of the wider United Nations membership. By contrast, Malaysia firmly believes that in many situations, effective action requires the support of the entire international community. By the same token, Malaysia firmly believes that the principles of transparency, interaction and dialogue with non-members, as well as efficiency, must be applied to the entire spectrum of the Council's work, including in the implementation of its resolutions.

Malaysia notes that some measures contained in document S/2006/507 to enhance the efficiency and transparency of the Council's work have been implemented. However, as this exercise has yet to be completed, regular interactions such as today's meeting will provide the necessary impetus for their implementation.

Some of the measures contained in document S/2006/507 — such as referring to all speakers at political and ambassadorial level by name and title and ensuring that draft documents be made available to non-Council members when these documents are introduced within informal consultations — lend themselves to quick implementation; others less so. Those include such measures as having subsidiary bodies of the Council seek the views of Member States and having sanctions committees seek the views of those States affected by sanctions, which have either not been put in place or have been done sporadically and sparingly. This statement is focused on those measures.

In cases where sanctions committees meet to discuss the requests of States to de-list entities or individuals from consolidated lists, that particular State should have the opportunity to either listen in on the proceedings of the Committee or be officially informed of the proceedings in which their requests were considered. This would enable the State concerned to better understand why certain de-listings took place, while others did not.

Further, we believe that the briefings given by the special representatives or heads of United Nations missions or by the Secretariat to the Council are inherently useful because they provide an account of what is actually happening on the ground.

We advocate, therefore, greater transparency in the briefings made to the Security Council and for non-Council members to be allowed to hold watching briefs without the right to interject or interact. This would not only generate greater interest in these issues among the entire membership, but would also afford non-members of the Council the chance to understand subjects and viewpoints of the Council.

Finally, we would like to touch on the thematic debates that now form the norm in the Council's monthly programme of work. Malaysia appreciates the fact that regional and subregional organizations are also invited to speak and participate in open thematic debates, particularly when such debates are relevant to a given organization. Further, we hope that the new trend of increased interaction with troop-contributing countries will be further expanded, given the indispensable role that those countries play in the maintenance of peace and security worldwide.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ecuador.

Mr. Carrión-Mena (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, allow me to thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this open debate, which will enable us to improve the implementation of the practices and new and existing measures contained in the note by the President in document S/2006/507 on the Council's working methods, taking into consideration the results of the last debate held in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968), as well as the most recent practices of the Council.

In the same way, thank you, Sir, for the concept paper circulated as an annex to your letter of 1 April (S/2010/165), in which you propose to focus this meeting on three basic issues: the transparency of the Security Council, interaction with non-members of the Council and the efficiency of the Council. You also

provide several examples of the possible issues you believe might be discussed at this meeting.

In that respect, my country, Ecuador, associates itself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, reiterating the Movement's position at the fifty-first session of the General Assembly, as well as the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the Fifteenth Summit Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries Sharm el-Sheikh, of 2009, without prejudice to which I would like to make the following comments in my capacity as representative of Ecuador.

In the debate that took place on 27 August 2008 (see S/PV.5968), my country stressed that, despite some progress made in Security Council practices, the application of the measures in note S/2006/507 had been insufficient and uncertain. Unfortunately, almost two years later, we have seen that much still remains to be done to improve the implementation of these measures, especially those relating to transparency and to interaction with the rest of the Members of the United Nations, on whose behalf the Council should act, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations.

On the question of transparency, we note that Council Presidents have continued to hold informal briefings on the programme of work, after its adoption, and we note the informational meetings held by the chairs of subsidiary bodies of the Security Council on their respective activities.

However, with regard to the reports submitted by outgoing Presidents of the Council, there is no real systematic method in place or follow-up on the problems identified during their terms of office, which impedes the discussion and implementation of practical solutions.

Similarly, while we recognize the benefit for our region of the presentation of monthly reports by the Permanent Missions of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean that are members of the Security Council, it must be stated, in all honesty, that in many cases those reports have simply confirmed the lack of transparency between the permanent members of the Security Council and other Council members, thus contradicting the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the duty of the Council to respect them in carrying out its functions.

With regard to interaction and dialogue with countries that are not members of the Council, Ecuador appreciates the increased number of meetings open to participation by all Members of the United Nations over recent years, but regrets that such meetings continue to be the exception, while private consultations continue to be the rule. This is something that my country finds regrettable.

In this context, while we recognize the important role that closed consultations can play in seeking solutions to specific problems that come under the authority of the Security Council, my country reaffirms that priority should be given to incorporating the opinions of the other Members of the United Nations, in respect for the provisions of Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter. The same criterion should be implemented and strengthened for regional organizations and for countries that contribute troops to peacekeeping operations.

Likewise, I must point out that many of the open meetings held by the Security Council correspond precisely to topics that fall outside its jurisdiction, but which, regrettably, it continues to seek to cast, in a forced way, as threats to international peace and security in order to interfere with the mandates of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

Appropriate Security Council interaction with other Member States and the other principal organs of the Organization, within the scope of their respective areas of authority, would contribute to improving the effectiveness of the Council and would facilitate the elimination of those matters previously placed on its agenda but not covered by its mandate.

A permanent and transparent dialogue between the Council and the General Assembly, with each keeping to its proper purview, would also translate into higher quality for the annual and special reports which should be submitted in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

We hope that the ideas and proposals shared on the implementation of the measures contained in note S/2006/507 and on additional measures will be followed up on appropriately and that a timely report will be issued on their implementation, which should not be limited to the Security Council Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that, beyond the formalities of this debate, all members of the Security Council need to translate the concerns and proposals regarding the working methods of the Council into specific action that will make it possible to achieve the ultimate goal of guaranteeing the transparency, open interaction and effectiveness of the Council, without prejudice to other necessary and urgent reforms relating to its membership and representativeness.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Qatar.

Mr. Al-Nasser (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): It is a pleasure to see you, Sir, preside over the Security Council this month, and to see that you have chosen the issue of the working methods of the Council for consideration in an open debate during your presidency. Four years ago, we enjoyed working and coordinating with your delegation on this issue during our membership of the Security Council, and we appreciated your work as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

We welcome this opportunity to make some frank observations on the theme of this meeting, out of a genuine interest in improving the performance of this important body.

I should like at the outset to express our support for the statement delivered by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Developing and improving the working methods of the Security Council and related procedural issues are particularly important now as they are an integral part of the process of Security Council reform, which has both structural and functional dimensions. The previous review of the Council's working methods established the need for modernization and development, identified shortcomings that should be rectified and measures that should be taken in order to enable the Security Council to fully discharge its mandate in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to revitalize its work and to maintain its credibility.

The note by the President contained in document S/2006/507 was an achievement in itself. However, further useful suggestions have been made by various parties. At least during our membership of the Council, we did not see adequate implementation of the note's recommendations, however useful those recommendations were. Here, I would like to highlight a number of points, from which the Council may benefit when updating its rules of procedure — which it is called upon to adopt in Article 30 of the Charter. Since the Council represents all the Members of the United Nations, it should take their views into account when adopting its rules of procedure.

First, the question of the veto, although a sensitive one, remains one of the central issues of Security Council reform. I will not discuss here the radical changes that are being proposed and discussed in the framework of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform, the increase in its membership and other related matters. I will only stress that it is important that the veto not be used to thwart decisions of paramount importance for the maintenance of peace and security and the protection of human beings.

Second, we are also of the view that the Security Council should adopt resolutions invoking Chapter VII of the Charter only when necessary and in a manner that is fair, and when deploying peacekeeping missions. Even in those cases, the invocation of Chapter VII should be limited to those paragraphs of the resolution that are relevant to the self-defence of the mission and other provisions that require the use of Chapter VII.

Third, I want to stress the issue of coordination between the Security Council and other United Nations organs, in particular the General Assembly, in the discharge of their mandates. In this context, we call upon the Security Council to improve the annual reports it submits to the General Assembly, in particular with regard to the quality of their analytical aspects and their recommendations. We also have views concerning the frequency of meetings between the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Security Council, which are at the heart of the coordination between the two organs. Increasing the benefits resulting from these meetings can enhance the work of both organs. Already, it appears to be possible for the State holding the presidency of the Council to transmit a monthly assessment of the Council's work to the General Assembly.

Fourth, the Security Council should not only coordinate with other United Nations organs, but

should also enhance its coordination with regional and subregional organizations and entities, in line with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter, in order to enhance the success of Council measures to address issues on its agenda and contribute to the legitimacy of its work.

Fifth, the majority of United Nations Members have repeatedly stressed that the Security Council should not go beyond its mandate under the United Nations Charter, specifically Article 24. We stress here that the Council should not infringe on the functions of other United Nations organs on issues that do not involve international peace and security. At the same time, the Security Council should take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly on matters concerning the maintenance of international peace and security, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

Sixth, while we are aware of the complexity and sensitivity of the issues of which the Security Council is seized, which frequently require confidentiality, we emphasize the need to strike a balance between that requirement and the Council's responsibility to achieve transparency in its work and to serve the general membership of the United Nations. Here, we stress also the importance of consultation with the relevant authorities and of not making decisions behind closed doors. We have found it odd that, on a number of occasions, closed formal meetings have been held to consider items that do not require confidentiality, such as the periodic meetings with the President of the International Court of Justice. In the same context, we believe it would be useful to hold more Arria Formula meetings, which have proven more effective than formal meetings in addressing certain issues.

Seven, the Council has taken praiseworthy action to improve the listing and de-listing procedures of its counter-terrorism and sanctions committees, with a view to avoiding legal problems that have arisen. But the methodology of listing individuals and entities on the sanctions lists should be amended to conform to court decisions and follow legal due process.

Eight, while we know that the Security Council is a political organ, the documents it issues feed into international law and have an impact on it. We should therefore improve the work of the Council by involving legal experts from the Secretariat in the consideration of legal matters on its agenda and the agendas of its subsidiary bodies.

Ninth, we want to stress the importance of the careful selection of members of groups of experts working with subsidiary bodies, subject to the principle of equitable geographical distribution and in consultation with all Council members.

Finally, the Security Council website has proven to be an indispensable tool for following and facilitating the Council's work, and we are delighted that is being developed to keep pace with increasing demand on the part of many actors. We also welcome the endeavours of the Secretariat to promote the institutional memory of the Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Sial (Pakistan): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for holding this open debate on the working methods of the Security Council. We appreciate the interest of Japan in the subject, as reflected in document S/2006/507 and the in concept paper for today's debate annexed to the President's letter dated 1 April 2010 (S/2010/165).

We avail ourselves of this opportunity to acknowledge the role played by the group of five small countries (S-5) on the issue of working methods. The group that modestly calls itself the small five has always provided big input on the subject.

We associate ourselves with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Egypt in his capacity as Chair of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), and endorse his letter (S/2010/189) dated 15 April 2010 addressed to the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We hope that the NAM position reflected in the comprehensive negotiating paper (see A/51/47) and the relevant paragraphs of the Sharm el-Sheikh final document (S/2009/514, annex) will be given due consideration in our collective deliberations.

Article 24, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Charter stipulates that, in carrying out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Council acts on behalf of the United Nations Member States. Therefore, the efficiency and transparency of the Council's work and its decision-making process are issues of great interest and importance to the United Nations membership. It is

therefore also essential for the Council to comprehend the perception of the general membership of its work and of the methods it employs to carry out its mandate.

My delegation wishes to share with the Security Council our reflections on the Council's work. We will, however, limit ourselves to three areas outlined in the President's concept paper for today's debate, namely, transparency, interaction with non-members and the efficiency of the Council.

On transparency, we acknowledge some improvement in the working methods with respect to: presidential briefings on the programme of work; post-presidency assessments by respective presidencies; more frequent open debates; and improved reporting practices of the subsidiary bodies. These measures have, however, not comprehensively addressed the exclusivity of the Council's work.

The Pakistan delegation underscores the need for greater compliance with Articles 31 and 32 of the United Nations Charter and rule 48 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

The transparency of the Council warrants a semblance of balance between its open and closed meetings. We find the equation tilted towards confidentiality, even in areas where greater transparency would certainly help. Open debates and public meetings should not be a mere formality for decisions taken in informal or closed consultations, but should be a prominent factor in the Council's decision-making process.

The Security Council's progress in its interaction with non-member States will remain dependent on the level of transparency it wishes to attain. More structured interaction with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, as well as with troop- and police-contributing countries, will broaden the existing channels of communication. The consultation mechanisms should involve timely, two-way exchanges of information and views, which should be duly reflected in the Council's decision-making.

In our view, enhanced interaction with regional organizations can also be an effective channel of communication with the wider United Nations membership. In this context, the Council's increased interaction with the African Union is a good example to emulate with other regional organizations.

We agree with the assessment in the concept paper that the efficiency of the Council is constrained by the volume and diversity of its workload. However, we do not share the view that the efficiency of the Council is compromised by lengthy statements or the time period required each year for the adjustment of five new non-permanent members to the workings of the Council.

The efficiency of the Council can be enhanced if the necessary and due attention is paid to the issues on the basis of their merit rather than narrowly focusing on the national interests of those who matter. Besides, the Council should focus on its primary role for the maintenance of international peace and security instead of taking up issues that are better dealt with by other relevant bodies.

Efficiency is also closely linked to effectiveness. In recent years, the Security Council has been relatively effective in peacebuilding ventures and in addressing internal crises. Its record has been less impressive in resolving inter-State conflicts, where the Council seems constrained either due to the use of the veto or the failure to have substantive recourse to the pacific settlement of disputes in the terms of Chapter VI of the Charter.

Today's debate has underscored the fact that transparency, interaction with non-member States and the efficiency of working methods are interlinked and mutually reinforcing. That also validates the most widely held view that improving the working methods of the Council in their entirety would make the Council more democratic, inclusive and accountable to the wider membership. Such a change could be brought about by a process of election and rotation.

In the constructive spirit of today's debate, we believe that the Security Council should continue its introspection with regard to improving its working methods. At the same time, this issue is also an integral part of the comprehensive reform process that is currently at the stage of intergovernmental negotiations. We would like to conclude by stating that the consideration of this issue must continue in both forums, with a view to seeking fresh ideas. One track should not obviate the scope and importance of the other.

The President: I now give the floor the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Park In-Kook (Republic of Korea): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's meeting to discuss an issue of great interest to the entire membership, namely, enhancing the working methods of the Security Council. We appreciate this follow-up after the debate held last August, and believe it will be helpful to assess the progress made thus far. My delegation is also grateful to the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, whose work is instrumental in meeting the expectations of the membership with regard to the functioning of the Council.

The President's note of 2006 (see S/2006/507) was an important starting point that laid out concrete measures that, if implemented, would largely address the concerns and grievances widely voiced by the membership, while simultaneously raising overall satisfaction with the way in which the Council conducts its business. In that regard, we believe that efforts have been made to enhance the overall transparency, accountability and inclusiveness of the Council, in spite of its ever-increasing workload.

We are particularly pleased to note that the number of open meetings has increased steadily vis-à-vis closed meetings and consultations. However, the substantive nature of these open meetings could be further improved, as they are frequently adjourned after the introductory adoption of the agenda, and the core discussions proceed largely in closed consultations.

We also believe that the participation of non-members that are parties to any dispute under consideration in the Council's discussions should be ensured to the maximum, as we have found from our own experience that such interactions are immensely helpful.

Members of the Council are also making a commendable effort to share the work of the Council, for example by routinely providing briefings to their respective regional groups. Those are all steps in the right direction that go a long way towards addressing the frustrations felt by the wider membership.

We also appreciate the dedication of the Secretariat in providing relevant documents, including the reports of the Secretary-General, in a timely manner, as they are primary sources of information for Member States that do not sit on the Council. However, transparency and inclusiveness could be even better served by more substantive and analytical reports from the Security Council. The publications and submissions of the Council could be qualitatively improved to allow the wider membership more insight into its work. The Council may start out by refining its annual reports to the General Assembly to add analytical value, rather than stopping at simply giving descriptions of the work of the Council in a given year.

In addition to the measures contained in the President's note, we recognize that the Council has utilized innovative ad hoc meeting formats on a case-by-case basis in order to allow greater interaction with concerned parties and to garner meaningful input from them. It would be useful to structure and institutionalize practices that have proved productive, so that the Council's efficiency and effectiveness, as well as access by interested non-members, can be strengthened.

As a troop-contributing country (TCC) and one of the major financial contributors to peacekeeping operations, the Republic of Korea finds TCC meetings to be very useful and informative. We appreciate having more meaningful and substantive participation in the early decision-making process for peacekeeping missions.

Lastly, we would like to stress that improving the working methods of the Security Council is an important component of Council reform. That linkage sometimes results in the tendency to put the issue of working methods on the back burner while we wait for a comprehensive reform to materialize. The working methods of the Council should certainly be pursued in tandem with overall reform, but it is by its own merit too important to delay or neglect. In addition, we believe that implementing feasible measures to enhance working methods can add impetus and much-needed energy to the broader reform.

The President: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.